

the University of San Francisco. She said:

Our children's education has been a family project. We all contribute as much as possible.

Our second son, who was also accepted here at the University, is instead attending a community college until his brother finishes here to help defer costs. We feel there are no extras in our life we can eliminate. However, because we believe so strongly in higher education, the sacrifices go almost unnoticed.

Mr. Speaker, I urge our colleagues to reject any of the ill-conceived proposals made by the Republican majority to eliminate this opportunity for higher education for our young people and thus weaken our country.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1271, FAMILY PRIVACY PROTECTION ACT OF 1995

Mr. DIAZ-BALART, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-97) on the resolution (H. Res. 125) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1271) to provide protection for family privacy, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 660, HOUSING FOR OLDER PERSONS ACT OF 1995

Mr. DIAZ-BALART, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-98) on the resolution (H. Res. 126) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 660) to amend the Fair Housing Act to modify the exemption from certain familial status discrimination prohibitions granted to housing for older persons, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

□ 1830

ANOTHER JEWEL FOR MR. MURDOCH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KINGSTON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I must say I rise tonight, and I am very saddened by what we now know happened last week. We know that we are going to be taking up the tax bill this week, but last week we took up a bill that we thought we knew what was in. We thought it was closing loopholes. We thought that it was going to shut off tax breaks to owners who were selling their broadcast stations or whatever to minorities, the infamous Viacom issue.

And today we now learn that tucked away in there was a nice \$63 million jewel for none other than Rupert Murdoch and, of course, Mr. Murdoch also happens to be the publisher of the Speaker's infamous book. Could there

be a connect-the-dots here? I do not know. Everybody is saying "Couldn't possibly be."

But I must say, as a Member of the House, I really feel we were all hoodwinked, because this did not come up in the House at all. It came up in the Senate, and apparently the Senate yielded, or the House yielded to the Senate in conference on this. None of us were told about this, and this was slipped in.

I was fascinated to read in the press reports this weekend that people were blaming Senator CAROL MOSELEY-BRAUN for this, and I love her quote in the press. She said, "If I had one bit, one iota of the leverage the Speaker said I do, then I would have kept the tax incentives for everybody," because Senator BRAUN has made it very clear she approves of these kind of tax incentives.

So is it not interesting that the tax incentives went down for every other person, every other person, group, or entity except Mr. Murdoch? Now, I suppose this could be just how the stars align, but we all know his long, longstanding tradition of having a book done by Margaret Thatcher when he needed things in the British Parliament, and, of course, he also published Ding Mao Mao's book in China when he was trying to get his broadcast license in there that we have been reading about even more this week, and I just think it is really time we blow the whistle on this kind of special-interest legislation.

Somebody who has got a crown like he has got does not need any more crown jewels, not at a time we are killing school lunches, threatening student loans, zeroing out summer jobs, taking on Big Bird and everything else. Why does he get this huge, wonderful jewel?

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I want to associate myself with her remarks.

This is simply an outrageous misuse of the public trust to have this item slipped into a conference committee with no notification of the House Members that this matter was in the conference bill, in fact, the appearance of deliberately keeping it from the House Members so this could be voice-voted on the floor last week when Members were concerned with the deductibility of the health care insurance for the self-employed, and then to find out that what we have in here is the most special of special deals for one person when the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means and others strenuously objected to this kind of matter being brought forward, turned down amendments to try to make some rules that would apply to everybody across the board, now find out the 17 or 18 other similar deals were turned down, but the one for Rupert Murdoch, the

one involving the Speaker, was now somehow felt into this legislation.

We started out the 100 days with a book contract with Rupert Murdoch. Now we are ending it with all of the speculation about what that meant, and now, of course, the speculation is no longer speculation. Now we have the concrete treatment of Mr. Murdoch differently than anyone else in the United States at the behest of the leadership—

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Absolutely.

Mr. MILLER of California. In the House and the Senate.

I want to thank the gentlewoman for raising this issue.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I thank the gentleman from California for bringing it up, because I really feel the Members were also led astray. Members on the conference committee on our side did not know this was happening, and I find it also amazing Mr. Murdoch stands there and with a straight face says, at least through his spokesman, he did not know about this; he did not seek it; and he did not particularly want it.

So I would say he ought to give it back. He ought to give it back.

Mr. MILLER of California. Since Mr. Murdoch is as successful as he is, when you consider all of the things that he has denied knowledge of that affect his business interests, over the last 100 days, but yet somehow he has tremendous success, and apparently it just falls on him.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. One of the other things I find really amazing is that he could be so successful, that this little \$63 million jewel could roll off the table, and he just did not even really have to pay much attention to it. It must be nice. Think of the school lunches it would buy and the student loans it would provide.

This is outrageous.

SETTING THE RECORD STRAIGHT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I just happened to be walking through, and we should be accurate in what we say here on the floor of the House.

No. 1, the provision that was put into the health care deductibility for self-employed was engineered and pushed and implemented by CAROL MOSELEY-BRAUN from Chicago, a Democrat Senator, and made its way into the conference report as a result of her compelling arguments that this in effect was a preexisting contractual obligation, a binding contract that was made before the effective date.

So we should fully understand that the gentlewoman from Colorado and the gentleman from California are just ill-informed about this particular provision.

I am not here to defend Rupert Murdoch. I do not know him, and have nothing to do with him. But I will simply say this also: that the facts are that Rupert Murdoch gets no tax benefits out of this provision even though it was engineered by a Democrat Senator from Illinois and put in the bill by a Democrat Senator from Illinois. The benefit does not go to Rupert Murdoch. He gets no tax break out of this provision, and the facts should be presented to the American people rather than all of this continued rhetoric with all of the props of golden crowns and all of the other things that are emotionally presented to this House.

We should deal with the facts as they exist.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARCHER. I am happy to yield to the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Is the gentleman saying the stories then in the press are incorrect, because they say they are validated?

Mr. ARCHER. I have seen a lot of stories in the press that are inaccurate.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Is this story incorrect?

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I reclaim my time.

The gentlewoman has a press report that she is holding up for the benefit of this House, and we all know that you cannot rely on the accuracy of press reports. They pick up on certain items that are presented to them, and then they are rapidly put into print. It does not mean they are accurate.

And in this case, the accuracy of the situation is as I stated, and I am not here to defend Rupert Murdoch. But I think the gentlewoman, the Senator from Illinois, who put this into the conference report certainly should be asked. I do not think she was trying to do any sort of a favor for Rupert Murdoch, and as she presented it, she was not trying to give a special favor to anybody, but simply to say that the binding-contract rule to prevent retroactivity should apply with a certainty to this particular transaction.

If this had not been a binding contract, there is no question in my mind that it would never have been embraced in the Senate offer and would never have gotten into the conference report. But it is also very, very important to know that this has absolutely nothing to do with the tax bill and spending reduction bill that will be coming on the floor of this House this week.

So I just wanted to be here to set the record straight on this issue.

FURTHER SETTING THE RECORD STRAIGHT

(Mrs. SCHROEDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to say that my point was, No. 1, Members did not know that the

House had yielded to the Senate on this issue when this bill came to the floor. This was portrayed as a bill in which we were trying to help people get their tax credit back for health care. That is what we were told about.

We were told this was done away with across the board. We were not told there was one special little loophole, oops.

Now, I do not know if the press report is correct or not, but it says it was verified by six Republican staffers. So that is quite a few.

Maybe they were all wrong. I do not know. I am not on the committee.

But as a Member of this House, I resent it when we have a conference report come back with a goodie in it and we are not told about it.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the whole point of the provision of the Ways and Means bill was to cancel these business deals, to cancel them retroactively, and Rupert Murdoch was able to hold on to his deal, and nobody else was, and those are the facts. Those may not be the facts the gentleman from Texas likes, but those are the facts.

THE FACTS ABOUT HAITI

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, on March 31, President Clinton and President Jean-Bertrand Aristide and the Secretary General of the United Nations presided over ceremonies in Haiti for the transition from the multinational force led by the United States to the U.N. force. It was an impressive ceremony where the nations of the world, many contingents of the nations of the world, agreed to submit and march under the U.N. banner in order to continue the progress in Haiti toward democracy.

In the United States, this historic landmark received only moderate attention, but throughout the world and the international community, where most of the people of this planet live in underdeveloped nations, there was great rejoicing. I think that this was a special occasion where a new and special high standard was set for the new world order. A model for protecting democracy has been set in place as we go into the new world order.

The U.S. Government also has given new meaning to the concept of superpower. The U.S. superpower was used in this case to nurture democracy. The U.S. superpower was used to give the poorest nation in this hemisphere an opportunity to be born again. The U.S. superpower has demonstrated unmatched generosity and compassion. This is a superpower that has earned the right to prosper for a thousand

years. This is a superpower that all Americans should fight to maintain.

The hard job has been done. The great risks have been taken. It took a lot of guts by President Clinton to make unpopular decisions. Troops went into Haiti at great risk, anticipating great risk at first, but the decision was made despite that, and we have moved the situation with almost no casualties. The great risks have been taken.

But now a very important part of the job remains, and that is to help Haiti through a period of economic development. The nations of the world have made a commitment in Paris several months ago; nearly \$1.9 billion was committed to various activities to improve the Haitian economy, to jump start the economy until the private sector could take over.

It is unfortunate that despite the fact that this decision was made several months ago, almost no dollars have flowed to Haiti. The bureaucrats of the world, the bureaucrats in the various financial world organizations have moved at such a slow pace that they are tending to smother the greatness of this magnificent international deed.

I would like to quote from Strobe Talbott's report to the Congress some time ago:

For its part, the international community is doing its fair share by providing aid and technical assistance. Prior to the deployment of the multinational force, international donors and lenders met in Paris in August and determined that Haiti would need \$650 million in the first year after democracy was restored. This group met again in Paris last month to review the progress that has been made since President Aristide's return, and the general assessment of this progress was so positive that the donors actually pledged \$1.2 billion, nearly double what had originally been proposed. It is anticipated that \$900 million of that \$1.2 billion will be available over the next 12 to 18 months.

That was anticipated several months ago, but it has not happened. The bureaucrats are not moving the paper. The bureaucrats, because of their indifference or maybe laziness, what ever, the bureaucrats are threatening to smother the progress toward reestablishment of democracy in Haiti.

Troops have been there. Hard political decisions have been made. All has been put in place, but very little is happening.

I think Mr. Strobe Talbott again summed up the situation very well:

Mr. Chairman, the best defense of our Haiti policy is a simple one: We intervened in Haiti because it was in our national interest. We intervened after every other alternative had been exhausted, and we intervened because it was the right thing to do. Mr. Chairman, the American intervention in Haiti has been successful thus far. Now we must see the job through, and that means until the completion of the United Nations mission 12 months from now. As I have already stressed, we cannot solve Haiti's basic problems. The Haitian people must solve it themselves. But they will do it with the help of the international community.